REMARKS

Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-7, 28-30, and 34-36 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicants are amending claim 1. As a result, claims 1-7, 28-30, and 34-36 are pending for examination with claims 1 and 28 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 over Liu

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 7, and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,953,005 (Liu). The rejections are traversed.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a system for synchronizing and serving multimedia content in a distributed network environment. The system comprises a synchronization server, a content server, and a plurality of clients, wherein the synchronization server provides an indication of an update to a multimedia resource to the clients, and the content server provides content information to the clients based upon, and in response to, the indication provided by the synchronization server.

The Office Action asserted (in response to Applicants' previous remarks) that Liu teaches storing the information of the released songs in the database and providing a song list to the user for selection at col. 3, lines 35-42 and col. 4, lines 34-62 (Office Action, page 6, 16A). The Office Action further asserted that the cited sections of Liu thus teach a synchronization server that indicates update information of the song first, and then a user can make a selection based on the available song list (Office Action, page 6, 16A). Although Liu may teach providing an updated song list to a user's terminal, the user must make a selection of a song in the list so as to obtain the song from the server, as admitted by the Office Action (Office Action, page 6, 16A). Thus, at most, Liu may teach providing content information *partially* based on the indication of an updated song list, but the providing of the content is performed *in response to the user selecting a song* in the updated list (col. 4, lines 44-45).

To clarify the claim language, Applicants are amending the claim such that the content server provides content information to the clients based upon, *and in response to*, the indication provided by the synchronization server.

1044793.1

Nowhere do the cited sections of Liu teach that the content server provides content information to the clients based upon, and in response to, the indication provided by the synchronization server. Therefore claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Liu, such that the rejection of claim 1 under §102 as purportedly being anticipated by Liu should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5, 7, and 34-36 depend from claim 1, and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 over Richard

The Office Action rejected claims 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,162,060 (Richard). The rejections are traversed.

Claim 28

Claim 28 is directed to a computer-implemented virtual course system adapted to a distributed network environment. The course system comprises a content server providing course-related information, a plurality of clients adapted to exchange information with the content server, and a synchronization server, wherein the synchronization server provides an indication of an update to the course-related information to the clients, upon which at least one client sends a request for updated course-related information to the content server and the content server provides the updated course-related information to the at least one client in response to the request.

The Office Action asserted (in response to Applicants' previous remarks) that col. 6, lines 21-36 of Richard teaches posting updated information of the course to the student (Office Action, page 6, 16B). Applicants note the cited section of Richard does not teach that any updated content is presented to a student, and furthermore, nowhere does the cited section of Richard teach all the limitations of the claim, namely:

(1) the synchronization server providing an indication of an update to the course-related information to the clients,

(2) upon which at least one client sends a request for updated course-related information to the content server and

(3) the content server provides the updated course-related information to the at least one client in response to the request.

Applicants note that a user in Richard's system selecting to view course material is not a teaching of a *client* sending a request for updated course-related information to the content server, as *a client in the context of the claim does not encompass the user, but rather only the computer being utilized by a user.* The claim language is clear in this respect, since claim 28 refers to a plurality of clients adapted to exchange information with the content server, and a user would not be understood to be a client, or part of the client, as would be appreciated by those of ordinary skill in the art.

Nowhere do the cited sections of Richard teach a synchronization server that provides an indication of an update to the course-related information to the clients, upon which at least one client sends a request for updated course-related information to the content server and the content server provides the updated course-related information to the at least one client in response to the request. As per the cited sections of Richard, when a student working on a workstation 124 requests a course, this can prompt searching for the course by the server 106 attached to the LAN which the student's workstation is attached. (col. 4, lines 49-51). This searching process simply entails locating a server in the network that contains a copy of the course. (col. 4, lines 61-65). If none of the queried servers contain the course, the search for a course eventually leads to the main computer 102. (col. 4, lines 66-67). As stated above, it should be appreciated that *the student* using a workstation in Richard's teaching is not *a client*, but rather the workstation and the processes executing thereon are the client. *Hence any action that may be performed by the student in Richard should not be construed as meeting any of the limitations relating to the client in claim 28.*

The process taught by the above-mentioned cited sections of Richard is completely silent as to a synchronization server providing an indication of an update to the course-related information to the clients, upon which at least one client sends a request for updated course-related information to the content server and the content server provides the updated course-related information to the at least one client in response to the request. Therefore claim 28 patentably distinguishes over Richard, such that the rejection of claim 28 under §102 as purportedly being anticipated by Richard should be withdrawn.

Claim 29-30 depend from claim 28, and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu. The rejection is once more traversed.

As presented in the previous Office Action, Applicants traverse the assertion of the Office Action that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the step of updating a shared resource by one of the plurality of clients in real time. *As requested in the previous Office Action*, the Applicants respectfully challenge the assertions of the Official Notice and requests that *adequate references be provided which disclose or teach the assertion, as outlined by MPEP 2144.03.*

ENTRY OF THIS AMENDMENT IS PROPER UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116

No new issues would be raised by the entry of this amendment. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the claim language. The amended claim does not require additional searching. Thus, all claims are allowable. If the Examiner disagrees, the amendment at the very least presents the claims in better form for appeal and reduces the issues on appeal. Accordingly, entry of this amendment is proper and requested.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: 9/12/06

x9/12/06/x

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Randy J. Pritzker
Registration No.: 35,986
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
(617) 646-8000

1044793.1